DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 164 24 CG 004 205

By-Giammatteo, Michael C.
Descriptive Flow: Parent-Child Centers. Phase I.
Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-2871
Pub Date [68]
Contract-OEC-4-7-062871-3059
Note-14p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80
Descriptors-*Community Services, Culturally Disadvantaged, *Economically Disadvantaged, Evaluation Techniques, Federal Aid, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Program Evaluation, Social Problems, *Urban Renewal Agencies

The Parent-Child Center (P-CC), in the central area of Portland, Oregon, has as its objective the alleviation of the problems of inaccessibility and unresponsiveness of existing helping services in the area. It is hoped that through P-CC, central area residents, low-income, non-whites, will achieve the following (1) effective use of available services, (2) modification of existing programs to create responsiveness to problems, (3) involvement in problem-solving, and (4) development of methods to attack the causes of poverty and satisfy un-met needs. Program 200, an evaluation system, under the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, is being carried out in four areas which are required to produce an adequate evaluation of program operation, effectiveness and total impact: (1) the function of the contextual system as a matrix for Program 200, (2) the effectiveness of structural and administrative procedures in performance of the program as an instigator of institutional change, (3) the programmatic processes of the development team as facilitating the best use of techniques, and (4) the output and impact of Program 200 as successfully creating institutional change through technical innovations. The Evaluation Model utilizes four cycles and six types of data. (AE)

EDO 30164

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-6-2871
PA-24
OE-BR

PHASE I
DESCRIPTIVE FLOW: PARENT-CHILD CENTERS

Dr. Michael C. Giammatteo
Research and Development Specialist

Field Paper No. 16

The substance of this paper was reported during meetings of the Parent-Child Center staff. Preparation of the paper was performed pursuant to contract No. OEC-4-7-062871-3059 with the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the provisions of the Laboratory Program, Bureau of Research.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
400 Lindsay Building, 710 S. W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

CG 004205

PHASE I

DESCRIPTIVE FLOW: PARENT-CHILD CENTERS[1]

Brief History of the Parent-Child Center Program (P-CC)

In August 1964, President Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act which marked the formal beginning of the federal "War on Poverty." Under Title II of the Act, $340 million was appropriated to ". . .provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs." Such programs were to reduce poverty or its causes by ". . .developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn and work."[2]

At the inception of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the central area of Portland, Oregon suffered from many of the ills which the Economic Opportunity Act sought to rectify. This area contained the largest concentration of nonwhite persons in greater Portland. Up to 23 percent of all families in the area had annual incomes of less than $3,000, a rate approximately 40 percent higher than the city as a whole. The proportion of substandard or dilapidated housing within the central area was considerably higher than in any other sector of the city.

---

[1]All exhibits noted are available from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 400 Lindsay Building, 710 S. W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204.

[2]Public Law 89-794, "The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964," as amended.

Unemployment among adults and youths was higher, especially for Negroes who had lower average annual incomes than Caucasians.[3]

Available statistics show other social conditions and problems that accompany low income, unemployment and poor housing: a high proportion of broken families, low educational levels of parents and lower educational achievement by children in school. In short, what have come to be regarded as basic social provisions in this country in terms of family income, housing and education were seriously inadequate in the central area.

About 15 percent of 100,000 families within Portland's city limits had family incomes under $3,000 in 1960. Specifically, five target neighborhoods have been identified meeting this money criteria--Albina, Buckman, Brooklyn, Sunnyside and Richmond. Most of the Negro population of Oregon lives within the Portland city limits. The Albina area has over 60 percent of the 1960 nonwhite population (20,854 in 1960) and is located in northeast Portland adjacent to the other four areas noted earlier. These five areas had a total of about 4,000 families living in poverty.

As in other cities, the relationship between the persistence of these problems and the adequacy of public and private service agencies had not gone unnoticed by individuals and groups in the central area community. The individualized helping services such as public assistance, job training and legal aid were being criticized for their inaccessibility,

---

[3]U. S. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population: 1960, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Oregon, Final Report.

their manner of delivery and their unresponsiveness to the changing needs of the central area.

The agencies, it was charged, were too hard for people to reach. Some were located downtown or too far away for people who often lacked carfare or the energy to get to them. Some services were simply not available. Others were essentially nonexistent because the people who needed them did not know where they were or how to utilize them. Still other services were rendered inaccessible by the way they were offered. Red tape and impersonal regulations were baffling to people who had not acquired the skills mastered by the middle class for negotiating large bureaucracies. Rigid rules, sometimes coupled with instances of condescending or insulting behavior by agency personnel, could strip people of their dignity. Moreover, it was said, middle-class professionals--social workers, teachers, housing officials and others--lacked an understanding of the values and attitudes of low-income people.

Critics also noted another source of difficulty: fragmentation of services. Problems were interrelated, but relief was to be found only if the client could piece together services organized according to the specific functions of the agencies. Equally confusing was the necessity of shopping around among highly specialized workers within the same organization which seemed to lack internal communication and coordination among its various departments.

Unresponsiveness and inflexibility were imputed to the health, education and welfare agencies in contact with people in the central area. By default or design, the service organizations, it was said, insulated themselves from criticism and offered no channel for communication with

their actual or potential clients. It was asserted, moreover, that an imbalance of power existed between agencies and clients, between the "establishment" and low-income neighborhoods. The imbalance was said to be due partly to the fact that lower-income adults tended to participate less frequently and effectively in community affairs and because traditional community activities were headed by middle-class residents and professionals, making lower-income people uncomfortable in the face of unfamiliar formalities. As a result of meetings of interested individuals, organizations and agencies throughout the preceding spring and summer, the central area citizens met during early summer 1967 and developed a comprehensive plan for alleviating the prementioned concerns.

This group initiated the plans for a Parent-Child Center (P-CC), an operation which was to be similar to neighborhood service centers already funded by OEO in communities throughout the United States.

The purposes of the new community action program were to:

1. Promote effective and extensive use of all currently available services by central area residents.

2. Modify and enrich the kind and quality of existing programs so that they would respond more effectively and appropriately to the unique problems of the central area.

3. Promote and facilitate the involvement of central area residents in the solution of neighborhood problems.

4. Develop new approaches to attack the causes of poverty and to meet needs not now being met by existing programs and agencies.

Since its establishment, the P-CC program has performed a variety of functions in seeking to achieve these goals. Eventually, the Center hopes to serve as a physical meeting place for staff and central area

residents drawn into the program as participants, beneficiaries and employees. Currently the plan has provided a focal point around which various community programs and services could be coordinated and channeled into areas of need.

The Parent-Child community worker unit of the P-CC instituted an extensive outreach program to provide central area residents with information and referral to social services available in the central area and elsewhere. In addition, it has organized and mobilized groups for collective action on behalf of central area residents. (Exhibit 1, Field Paper 11.)

The program has provided concrete services to individuals and families in the central area. These services include day care for young children, children and teen recreational activities, study centers, employment counseling, job placement and assistance with housing problems and homemaking.

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) has been an important factor in unifying and coordinating the various direct action programs undertaken in the central area with funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity and other government agencies. Program 200 team members have served roles as advocates, as personnel preparing research utilization reports and as research design specialists. (Exhibit 2, Field Papers 10 and 12.)

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation Project

The P-CC program was not instituted to demonstrate or test the effectiveness of a given approach to resolving social problems. Rather,

it was aimed at providing immediate, interim solutions to the myriad problems faced by low-income residents in the central area. Although evaluation of these efforts was implied and assumed, no structure was created nor were funds allocated in the beginning to assess the effectiveness of the P-CC in achieving its goals and thereby reducing the incidence of poverty or mitigating its effects. However, two agencies--Portland State College and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory--described detailed evaluative plans and made provisions to fund the efforts.

The first effort to evaluate the P-CC was initiated in August 1968, immediately after P-CC became operational. At that time, a proposal to evaluate both the P-CC and the Bess Kaiser Aide programs (operating in low-income housing projects throughout Portland) was presented.

The Scope of the Evaluation Problem

The description of the Laboratory's Program 200 gives the impression that the program is complex in structure and process. However, if the program, as a whole, is viewed as a system which organizes and coordinates the operation of several subsystems (the activities), it is apparent there are many repetitions of structure and process throughout the total program. These repetitions simplify the evaluation problem and give depth to the analysis. They provide several opportunities for observing the effect of the structural relationships on the effectiveness of both the administrative and program content processes. Multiple points of observation also permit analysis of variations in administrative relationships and provide an opportunity for administrative innovation.

Viewing Program 200 as a system simplifies evaluation at the administration and production levels, but it broadens the scope of the problem in the area of program impact. A service program cannot be evaluated as a closed system; therefore, the context of the program system comes within the necessary scope of the evaluation. That is, Program 200 must be viewed as a service system operation within a larger contextual system which is both its client and a source of its operating material. Given this viewpoint, program evaluation must include an analysis of intersystem relationships. Thus, four areas which come under the evaluation of program impact:

1. The interfaces at which the Northwest Laboratory contacts the components of the larger system.
2. The degree of interpenetration which follows from cooperative endeavors.
3. Mutual adjustments of administrative procedures.
4. Temporary administrative structures.

The components and outputs of the program system possess (or reflect) characteristics of the contextual system as well as the characteristics imparted by the program system. This means the program evaluation must take into account the characteristics of the contextual system which are relevant to the services of Program 200. To be more explicit, the contextual system for Program 200 consists of all the educational institutions, systems, agencies and allied organizations in the Northwest region. The characteristics of all these component organizations which make them receptive or unreceptive to the Northwest Laboratory's Program 200 are relevant to the evaluation of program impact. Further, the characteristics of the people in these organizations which make them, as individuals,

receptive or resistant to Program 200 also are relevant to the evaluation of the program impact. It becomes necessary, then, to measure those characteristics of the contextual system which form the limiting/facilitating background to the program's operation. Also, remeasure following the dissemination pattern for an activity is necessary to trace changes in the contextual system and its components due to program impact.

An analysis of the outputs of Program 200 is another aspect of the evaluation problem. Program 200 has three types of outputs:

1. The training package (materials).
2. The trainees.
3. The trained workshop leaders who take over the training process in the mass dissemination phase of an activity.

The last two outputs--trainees and workshop leaders--are components of the contextual system as well as Program 200 outputs. This dual membership in the program and contextual systems requires that evaluation of these people as outputs be integrated with evaluation of changes in their attitudes, occupational behaviors, etc. These changes represent the impact on the institutions to which they belong. Their increase in skills represents a minimal level of institutional change traceable to Program 200. Further evidence of institutional change would lie in the spread of their skills to others, either directly or through subsequent workshops and in changes in others' attitudes toward workshops in general, etc. The evaluation of these trainees as output and impact must trace their relationship with their peers after training as well as their own use of the training.

To sum up the evaluation problem, there are four major areas of investigation required to produce an adequate evaluation of program

operation, effectiveness and total impact on its contextual system.

1. The contextual system must be evaluated to measure its function as a limiting/facilitating matrix for Program 200.

2. The structure and administrative procedures must be evaluated to determine if the program is properly mounted for effective performance of its function as an instigator of institutional innovation. Internal housekeeping factors for each major participating agency (Portland Metropolitan Steering Committee, Bess Kaiser Hospital, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and Portland State College) must be evaluated.

3. The programmatic processes of Program 200 must be evaluated to determine whether the development team is making the best use of such factors as available expertise in content areas, communication techniques to create a demand for training, and techniques of institutional involvement in the development of training materials to ensure the primary bases for dissemination of innovations. (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory)

4. The outputs of Program 200 and the impact of the program must be evaluated to determine to what degree Program 200 is successful in creating institutional change through the introduction of technical innovations. (Portland State College)

The Evaluation Model

The evaluation model proposed for Program 200 is designed to follow and assess the development and impact of each Program 200 activity using four evaluation cycles (see Diagram 1). The proposed model can be viewed as a specialized communication system emanating from the Research and Evaluation Division efforts of all agencies involved and organized to run approximately parallel to the administrative and development system through which the P-CC program is operated. The content of the communication in the evaluation system is intended to be restricted to evaluation purposes. The major reasons for setting up a new communication net for evaluation are to:

1. Preclude interference with the operation of the program.

2. Speed up the flow of feedback from evaluation procedures.

3. Eliminate the inevitable distortions of evaluative data that would result from feeding the data through an administrative reporting system.

In Cycles 1 and 2, the evaluation is task oriented. The type-form research questions which will shape the evaluation process are:

1. Is this task (process) relevant to the purposes and success of the activity? (Necessity of task)

2. Are the right people involved in this task? (Location of task in structure and schedule)

3. Is this task properly planned, supplied and supported? (Scheduling and supervision provided)

4. Does this task (process), in fact, contribute to program success as expected (required)? Two-fold answers (Adequacy of performance)

In Cycles 3 and 4, the evaluation focuses on the characteristics, attitudes and behaviors of people and institutions. The type-form research questions guiding the evaluation process in these cycles are:

1. What kind of person (institution) is this? (What is out there?)

2. What characteristics does this person (institution) have that are relevant to the success or failure of the program? (What are the limiting factors?)

3. What kinds of changes have occurred in personal (institutional) attitudes, characteristics or behaviors as a result of exposure to or involvement in the program? (What is the measurable primary program impact?)

4. Are the observed changes in the direction and of the quality expected?

The last section of Cycle 4 contains suggestions for various types of measuring techniques that could be used during the evaluation process. These suggestions are based on the assumption that the evaluation process

will include the use of such data collection methods as recording tapes; questionnaires to be filled out by trainees, workshop leaders, administrators, etc.; check lists and observation forms. It is expected that the basic set of evaluation instruments will be equally applicable to all the activities of Program 200.

Six Types of Data Arenas

There appears to be six general types of data to be collected during the evaluation process, each of them requiring different measuring techniques.

1. Characteristics of persons or institutions. Items such as age, sex, work experience; for institutions, number of schools, number of teachers, etc.

2. Attitudinal variables. Opinions about policies, size of classes, curriculum, authority relationships, etc.

3. Conceptualization of roles, functions, etc. What is a "good" teacher, a "good" student, etc.

4. Analytic descriptions and comparisons. Differences between goals and achievements, priority assignments, etc.

5. Psychological characteristics of persons and groups. Measures of rigidity, authoritariansim, bureaucratization, etc.

6. Official records of administrative relationships, number of people and institutions contacted and/or served, etc.

Diagram 1
THE CONTENT OF THE EVALUATION MODEL
FOR PROGRAM 200--P-CC

Evaluation Cycles	Cycle 1 Administrative Structure and Process	Cycle 2 Programmatic Process	Cycle 3 Outputs and Program Impact	Cycle 4 Contextual System
Evaluation Focus Is On	Structure Authority relationships Planning Coordination Supply Job allocation Budgeting Staffing Supervision	Feasibility study Design Use of experts Schedules Use of feedback Selection (of trainees, sites) Selection of senior trainers Training process Dissemination Supply	Training package Trainees Workshop leaders Second-level trainees	Institutional Attitudes Service needs Policies Insolation Conflict Turnover Trainees: Attitudes Skill level Experience Behaviors Trainees: Children Family Attitudes Learning-skills Behaviors Achievements
System Components Involved (Evaluation unit is always included)	NWREL Staff: Program Research-Evaluation Communication-Dissemination Activity teams Portland State: Agency behaviors Kaiser Hospital: Client use Metro. Steering: Political factors	NWREL Staff: Research-Evaluation staff Communication-Dissemination staff Activity teams Portland State: Dr. Wineberg Dr. Gervais Mrs. Braden Kaiser Hospital: Dr. Greenlick Mr. Columbo	Activity teams P-CC trainees Workshop leaders Second-level trainees Contextual system (sample)	Contextual system: Sample of institutions Sample of trainees
Evaluation Techniques and Measurements	Time/cost expectations Conflict Scales Attitude Scales Identification of trouble spots Exploration of alternatives in process, structure	Expectation/ Achievement ratings Ratings of process and products Ratings of criteria, math Exploration of alternative techniques	Rigidity and Bureaucratization Scales Expectation/ Achievement Scales Ratings of package Descriptive techniques	Rigidity Scale Bureaucratization Scale Semantic Differential Goal/Achievement Scales Attitude Scales -those acceptable to Com. (centers)

Specific Examples of Outcomes

Bess Kaiser Hospital will study the client use of hospital services (Exhibit 7). Specific information as to type and frequency of clients using Kaiser's service plus information concerning what Parent-Child community worker initiated the action will be available. Drs. Saward, Greenlick and Columbo are collecting and analyzing that data.

Portland State College will have data on number, type and characteristics of people involved in P-CC planning meetings. A technical interview plus examination of meeting notes will be used. Dr. Ken Gervais is responsible for this data. Dr. Rita Wineberg hopes to study the ripple effect of attendance at these meetings. That is, what happens to the agency that participated in P-CC planning meetings and what happened to the person representing the agency. Mrs. Braden, a doctoral candidate, plans to study the interaction both at a peer level and in the family setting of those trained as Parent-Child community workers (see Field Paper 11).

Descriptive techniques concerning the activity flows will be the responsibility of Dr. Giammatteo and Dr. Rath of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.